REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed January 3, 2007.

Currently, claims 1-3, 5-15, 17-24, 26-35, 37-42, and 44-50 are pending. Applicants have amended claims 1-3, 5, 6, 13-15, 17, 18, 22-24, 26, 27, 33-35, and 37-42, cancelled claims 4, 16, 25, 36, and 43, and added new claims 47-50. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-3, 5-15, 17-24, 26-35, 37-42, and 44-46 and consideration of claims 47-50.

I. Objection to Claims 15, 38, and 43

Claims 15 and 38 have been amended to properly correct their dependency. Claim 43 has been cancelled. Reconsideration of claims 15 and 38 is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-39 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for failing to clearly define the term "complex" in the claims. The claims have been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Reconsideration of claims 1-39 is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 20, and 39 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 20, and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Berkley (US 6,351,843). Because Berkley does not disclose all of the limitations of claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 20, and 39, Applicants assert that the claims are patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim 1 is not anticipated by Berkley because Berkley does not disclose "determining whether to modify said method, said step of determining whether to modify said method includes determining whether said method calls another method." Instead, Berkley discloses inserting a tracing function into an existing application **based on the user's tracing preferences**. The inserting occurs after the user modifies the configuration settings according to which "methods" are to be traced:

> [A] user need only update the runtime's configuration settings and run the application. Upon seeing a configuration setting that indicates that methods of a particular class should be traced, the runtime will dynamically insert the tracing function into the inheritance hierarchy of that class (col. 7, lines 5-11).

The user modifies the configuration settings based on which methods the user would like to trace. The decision to "modify [a] method" is not based on a determination of whether the "method calls another method." The user instead simply chooses which methods to "modify." Because the cited prior art does not disclose "determining whether to modify said method, said step of determining whether to modify said method includes determining whether said method calls another method," the reference does not anticipate claim 1. Claims 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 20, and 39 and new claims 47-50 are distinguishable over the prior art for the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these claims.

IV. Rejection of Claims 2-6, 14-18, 40, and 44 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2-6, 14-18, 40, and 44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Berkley. Because the cited prior art, together with the knowledge of one having ordinary skill in the art, does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the rejected claims, Applicants assert that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Berkley does not teach or suggest "determining whether to modify said method, said step of determining whether to modify said method includes determining whether said method calls another method." Furthermore, it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to develop the claimed features. The knowledge of one having ordinary skill in the art adds nothing

regarding "determining whether to modify said method... [including] determining whether said method calls another method" since it would not be obvious to "modify said method" based on these limitations. Therefore, Berkley would not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to develop the claimed invention as described in claims 2-6, 14-18, 40, and 44. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these claims.

V. Rejection of Claims 9, 11, 19, 21-38, 45, and 46 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 9, 11, 19, 21-38, 45, and 46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Berkley in view of Berry (US 6,662,359). Because the cited prior art, alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the rejected claims, Applicants assert that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Berkley, as discussed above, does not disclose "determining whether to modify said method, said step of determining whether to modify said method includes determining whether said method calls another method," as recited in claim 1. Claims 9, 11, 19, 21-38, 45, and 46 all contain a similar feature. Additionally, Berry does not teach or suggest this feature. Instead, Berry discloses inserting a hook into a class when an exception is called so that the method throwing the exception can be identified, yet no determination based on "whether [a] method calls another method" is disclosed. Therefore, the combination of Berkley and Berry does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the limitations of claims 9, 11, 19, 21-38, 45, and 46. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these claims.

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of claims 1-3, 5-15, 17-24, 26-35, 37-42, and 44-46 and consideration of claims 47-50 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone. Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including today, April 23, 2007.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment

to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 23, 2007

By: /Michelle Esteban/
Michelle Esteban
Reg. No. 59,880

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP
575 Market Street, Suite 2500
San Francisco, California 94105-4206
Telephone: (415) 369-9660
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665